

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated January 9, 2008.

Applicant respectfully requests copies of Applicant's Art Citation forms, submitted along with a Submission dated June 22, 2004 and the application filed on December 11, 2003, initialed and signed by the Examiner along with the next Office Action, since Applicant has not received those forms to date. Copies of the Applicant's Art Citation forms in question are enclosed herewith for the reference of the Examiner. Applicant requested these copies in the filed Amendments dated July 12, 2007 and December 10, 2007, but did not receive these copies with the respective responsive Office Actions, and the Office Actions did not indicate that Information Disclosure Statements were attached corresponding to the Applicant's Art Citation forms.

Claims 23-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Oom (6,738,625). Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In support of the rejection of independent claims 23, 31, 32, and 40-46, the Examiner, in referring to the feature of the one or more terminal resource controllers performing a control independent of a radio transmission scheme, cites column 7, lines 40-67 of Oom et al., in referring to the feature of the one or more base station resource controllers performing a control dependent on the radio transmission scheme, cites column 5, lines 6-40 of Oom et al., and in referring to the feature of the one or more terminal resource controllers managing one or more base station resource controllers, cites column 8, lines 1-25 of Oom et al., and cites Figs. 1-2 or 1-4 of Oom et al., (Office Action, page 2, paragraph 2, lines 3-10; page 3, line 18, to page 4, line 11; page 5, line 11, to page 7, line 19).

However, it is respectfully submitted that the cited portions of Oom et al. nowhere teach, disclose, or suggest the features of the independent claims claiming one or more terminal resource controllers performing a control independent of a radio transmission scheme and one or more base station resource controllers performing a control dependent on the radio transmission scheme. Indeed, Oom et al. appears to teach away from performing control dependent on a radio transmission scheme since it states that,

“Aspects of GSM systems, as well as the emerging Wideband Code Division Multiple Access (WCDMA) standard, are used to describe embodiments of the present invention. However, it should be understood that the principles of the

present invention are applicable to other wireless communication standards (or systems), especially those in which control of radio transceiver stations may be separated from the radio transceiver station sites.”

(Oom et al., column 4, lines 42-49; emphasis supplied).

Since each of claims 24-30 and 33-39 is directly dependent upon one of independent claims 23 and 32, each of claims 24-30 and 33-39 is allowable for the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of the respective one of independent claims 23 and 32.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of claims 23-46 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING  
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY  
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
EFS FILING SYSTEM  
ON APRIL 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ  
Registration No.: 30,576  
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP  
1180 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8403  
Telephone: (212) 382-0700